

Appl. No. 10/775,405
Amdt. dated January 24, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 11, 2005

REMARKS

The present application is directed to a new class of androgen antagonists and their use in the treatment of androgen responsive conditions. The undersigned would like to extend his appreciation to the Examiner for noting the typographical error in claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to correct those errors and to delete non-elected subject matter. Claims 10, 12, 13, and 16 have been cancelled. New claims 17 and 18 have been added that are directed to preferred embodiments and specific compounds.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 112

A) Rejections under the Second Paragraph

Claim 1 was rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112, due to the periods after the letters. This typographical error has been corrected. Claims 14 and 15 were also rejected. Claims 14 and 15 have been amended as suggested by the USPTO to render this rejection moot.

B) Rejections under the First Paragraph

Claim 11 was rejected under the first paragraph of 35 USC 112 due to the phrase "alleviating a condition". The USPTO is taking the position that "alleviation" is not described by the specification. In order to render this rejection moot, the claim has been amended. The claim now refers to "treating" a condition. Further, the claim specifies that an "effective amount" should be administered to the patient. Prostate cancer and BPH have also been deleted from claim 11.

It is respectfully submitted that the specification does describe treating and claim 11 as amended is enabled. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 11, lines 16-19 of the specification, where the term "treat" is defined. Further on page 20, beginning at line 3, and continuing thru page 21, more specific descriptions of treating are given. Dosage ranges for systemic and topical administrations are discussed. Suitable routes of administration are reviewed. Detailed treatment regimens are described for alopecia, hirsutism, excess sebum, acne, etc. It is respectfully submitted that the specification does enable the treatment of the

Appl. No. 10/775,405
Amdt. dated January 24, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 11, 2005

diseases specified in claim 11 as amended. All of these conditions are androgen dependent and there is literature precedence for using androgen antagonists as a treatment modality.

Claim 10 was also rejected under the first paragraph of 35 USC 112/101. It is submitted that these rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of this claim.

Withdrawal of the rejections of record and reconsideration is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted the case is in condition for allowance. However, if the USPTO feels that minor amendments are required to place the case in condition for allowance, the undersigned invites a phone call to discuss any such proposed amendments.

1/24/06
Date

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Dixon
Reg. No. 32,410
(734) 622-1705